THE RESOLVING OF CONSCIENCE,

upon this Queſtion,

Whether upon ſuch a Suppoſition or Caſe, as is now uſually made [The King will not diſcharge his truſt, but is bent or ſeduced to ſubvert Religion, Lawes, and Liberties] Subjects may take Armes and reſiſt? and whether that Caſe be now?

RESOLVED,

I. *That no Conſcience upon ſuch a Suppoſition or Caſe can finde a ſafe and cleare ground for ſuch reſiſtance.*

II. *That no man in Conſcience can be truly perſwaded, that the reſiſtance now made is ſuch, as they themſelves pretend to, that plead for it in ſuch a caſe.*

III. *That no man in Conſcience can be truly perſwaded that ſuch a caſe is now,* that is, *that the King will not diſcharge his truſt, but is bent to ſubvert &c.*

Whence it followeth,

That the reſiſtance now made againſt the higher Power is unwarrantable, and according to the Apoſtle Damnable, *Rom.* 13. Alſo that the ſhedding of bloud in the purſuit of this reſiſtance is Murder.

By H. FERN D. D. *&c.*

The ſecond Edition corrected and amended.

Wo unto them, that call evill good, and good evill; that put darkeneſſe for light, and light for darkeneſſe: Iſa. 5. 20.

O my ſoule come not thou into their ſecret Gen. 49. 6.

Oxford, Printed for *VV. VVebb.* M. DC. XLIII.

D.

B.N.C.
F.MADAN
OXFORD

BODL. LIBR.
25 JAN. 1917
OXFORD

To all Miſſe-led People in this Land.

HE that in theſe times will ſpeak any thing to the people in behalfe of the King, is likely to do it upon diſadvantage, and be heard with prejudice: but they that would be profitably informed by what they heare, muſt lend an equall eare to what is ſpoken; which I hope you will doe, being ſuch, for the moſt part, as profeſſe to make a conſcience of your wayes. I deſire therefore of you into whoſe hands this Treatiſe ſhall come, that you would receive it with mind and affection, anſwerable to that wherewith it is offered to you, free from partiality and private reſpects; that you would conſider Caſes of Conſcience are written out of Conſcience: And were a diſtreſſed Prince a fit object for flattery, or this kinde of inſtruction capable of ſuch language, yet is this a time for every man to informe and ſpeake his Conſcience; and as many of you as ſhall reade me in this booke, will, I hope, conceive, I had no other purpoſe in the publiſhing of it, then to give teſtimony to the truth for the directing of your Conſciences and the diſcharge of mine owne. I have therefore written it plainly without affectation of curioſity, having reſpect only to your profit; the Learned through the Land are ſufficiently perſwaded, and I may aſſure you all Ages have aſſerted this truth, out of which I could have drawne a cloud of witneſſes, and preſented them to your ſight, but thought it more expedient for your direction, to ſhew you the cleare light of Divine Scripture and rectified Reaſon, the onely rules of Conſcience: and if by theſe you ſhall be brought to ſee the crookedneſſe of the New Doctrine of theſe times, and the uneven dangerous windings of this way of reſiſtance, I have gained the end of my deſires, and you have not loſt by it.

One thing I muſt note as ſtrange, that to diſcourſe upon this argument ſhould be thought (as it is by many) a worke altogether beyond the profeſſion of the Divine. Indeed popular Stateſmen have alwaies held it very impolitick and unreaſonable, that Subjects ſhould not in dangers imminent have means to ſave themſelves by a power of reſiſtance, and accordingly framed their principles and grounds of State as unqueſtionable. We examine not the power or wiſdome of Law-makers, but when we receive their Law, Declaration, or Command, and know it *in terminis*, underſtand it in the ſenſe it beares, certainly it belongs to the Divine to conſider whether it be againſt Gods Law, and accordingly to inſtruct his people. If it be agreed upon as a thing knowne in this State, that the King is *the higher Power* according to Saint *Paul*, *the Supreme* according to Saint *Peter*, *the Father of the Common-wealth* according to the fifth Commandement, ſurely it belongs to the Divine to urge obedience, honour, and ſubjection, according to thoſe places, and reprove reſiſtance forbidden there: Which obedience we acknowledge to be limited and circumſcribed by the eſtabliſhed Lawes of the Land, and accordingly to be yeilded or denied to the higher power, if thoſe Lawes be not repugnant to the Law of God: And for Reſiſtance, as we have not yet heard of any Law of the Land that commands or warrants it, ſo we know that were there any Law or Ordinance made to enjoyne it, ſuch would not bind, being againſt the Apoſtles expreſſe prohibition, back'd with arguments drawne from the very reaſon of Government, as ſhall be ſhewen in this following Treatiſe.

Be they who they will that preſent you with imminent dangers, and worke upon your feares, that tell you of Fundamentall Lawes, and give you rules of poliey to captivate your reaſon; when all that's done, it is the Divine that muſt ſettle the conſcience, which will not be quiet, if in yeilding obedience to any Law or Ordinance, it comes to a ſuſpicion, that ſuch an Ordinance of man entrencheth upon the Word of God.

Let me tell you (for I ſuppoſe you follow this way *in the ſimplicity of your hearts*) how you are wrought upon by them that miſ-lead you. You are dealt with according to your generall deſire of the continuance of true Religion and the Subjects Liberty, not according to the particular grounds of ſafety which conſcience doth require: You are told,

ſold, the Goſpell, and your Liberties, and all you have are in moſt imminent danger, and without taking Armes for the defence, irrecoverably loſt; and that this is lawfull by the Fundamentals of this Kingdome: You muſt take all this upon truſt, without an expreſſe and particular warrant, to rule and ſecure your Conſcience againſt the expreſſe words of the Apoſtle forbidding reſiſtance, *Rom.* 13.

You profeſſe your ſelves enemies to Popery, and good reaſon for it, but why ſhould you therefore be enemies to your King that declares againſt it too. I would you could obſerve how, under pretence of keeping out Popery, you are led in this way of reſiſtance by the like ſteps that brought Popery in. For examine your hearts and try if the name of *Parliament* (which is of honourable eſteeme with all) be not raiſed to the like exceſſe of credit with you, as the name of the *Church* is with the Papiſts; if you have not within you a ſilent thought of infallibility in that great Councell, and ſo with an implicite faith are ready to receive and maintaine whatever is concluded there; if you be not drawne to believe your Prince is minded to overthrow Religion, and upon ſuch a ſuppoſall or beliefe (according to the very method of Jeſuiticall practices) to take up Armes againſt Him. If you do not reſt ſatisfied with a generall intention of a good end, that is, the defence of Religion, not examining the meanes, you now uſe, to compaſſe that end; like thoſe that for the advancing of the Catholike cauſe, as they call it, attempt any thing however unjuſt, even to the deſtruction of Kings, that are ſet over them; this blindneſſe is Popiſh, and practice Jeſuiticall. Laſtly, examine your hearts, if you be not confirmed in your way by the number of your Profeſſours, like as they are by the univerſality of their Church, reſting upon the perſons of men, not trying the cauſe it ſelfe by the touch-ſtone of divine Scripture and rectified Reaſon. I know it prevailes with many thouſands of you, becauſe you ſee, as you thinke, and uſe to ſay, All good people that have ſenſe of Religion, and conſcience of their wayes, doe goe along with you, and you cannot believe that God would ſuffer them to be ſo generally deluded; let me tell you, you doe hereby very uncharitably conclude upon all thoſe *that runne not with you to the like exceſſe*: and I may ſay without breach of charity, they that appeare with you in the cauſe, would not all be found ſuch as you conceive them to be, if they were examined by the true markes of Chriſtian profeſſion, that is, by the

true doctrine of faith, by their charity, honeſty, obedience, meekneſſe of ſpirit, and the like; without which *your Religion is vaine*, what ever your exerciſes or performances of duties be; the Phariſee's righteouſneſſe will exceed yours, and his frequency and length of prayer will be as ſure a marke as yours; nay the *Anabaptiſt* at this day will out-doe you in any of your formes of godlineſſe. I doe not ſpeake this againſt the frequent and ſincere performance of holy duties: God forbid I ſhould. Nor doe I ſpeake it of you all: I know there are many good and conſcientious men that goe your way in the *ſimplicity of their hearts*, as thoſe did that followed *Abſolom*; whom the juſt God ſuffers hitherto to be deceived, that even by their example this power of Reſiſtance may gather ſtrength to the juſt puniſhment of this ſinfull Land, and that they themſelves when their eyes ſhall be opened (which, I hope, will be ere long) may ſee their owne weakneſſe, and be ſo much more humbled for it.

In the meane time you are according to the blindneſſe of a Popiſh way in all the former reſpects, carried on againſt all rules of conſcience; for you have neither certaine knowledge of your Princes heart, to reſolve for reſiſtance upon a ſuppoſall of ſuch intentions in him; nor have you any certaine rule to warrant the lawfulneſſe of reſiſting upon ſuch ſuppoſall, and to ſecure you againſt the Apoſtles prohibition, and damnation laid upon it; nor have you any judgement of Charity, in concluding ſuch intentions in your Prince againſt his deepeſt Proteſtations made in ſuch times of his diſtreſſe, and without that all is nothing
1 Cor. 13. though you lay downe, as you thinke, your life for Religion. How much ſafer would it be for you to be guided by the ſure Rules of Conſcience, and (if it ſhould pleaſe God to bring upon you what you feare) to ſuffer unjuſtly, then in the unwarrantable prevention of it to doe unjuſtly.

To this purpoſe ſhall you finde this Treatiſe ſpeaking to you for the direction of your Conſciences. If you thinke it ſtrikes too boldly upon any thing concerning the Parliament, I deſire yours and their favourable interpretation, faine would I ſilence every thought and word that may ſeeme to reflect upon that High Court; but what is neceſſary, I muſt ſpeake for truth and conſcience ſake, from which neither King nor Parliament ſhould make us ſwerve. Wee are taught that Kings muſt not be flattered; and the people ought to learne, that Parliaments

liaments muſt not be Idolized: That hath beene often charged as a fault upon the Clergy, and this I feare is that ſin of the people, which, together with the licentiouſneſſe indulged backe againe to them, ha's moved God to blow upon that wiſh'd-for fruit we might have reaped by this ſo deſited a Parliament. For when I ſee man is more ſenſible of every breach of his owne rights and priviledges, then of thoſe unparalleld breaches ſo frequently made upon Gods publike Worſhip, I cannot but thinke the Lord will require it of this Land; and when I ſee right and juſt ſubverted, property and liberty expoſed to the will and power of every one that is pleaſed to conceive his neighbour a Malignant, and able to make him ſo by commanding his goods and perſon, I cannot but complaine with the Pſalmiſt, *The foundations of the earth are out of courſe*; and appeale to Heaven, *Ariſe O God, judge thou the earth.* And I truſt, that albeit this Spirit of Seduction may prevaile awhile, and this way of reſiſtance proſper, for the great but juſt puniſhment of this ſinfull Land, the Lord will looke downe from Heaven, and make truth and peace againe to flouriſh out of the earth, will alſo looke upon the face of his Anointed, and by this affliction as by *a loving correction make him great.* Great to the maintenance of Gods true Religion, and to the reſtoring of the peace and proſperity of this Kingdome; And *Let all the people ſay, Amen.*

Pſal. 82.

Pſal. 18. 35.

The

The Contents.

SECT. I.

THe explication of the Queſtion, and generall Reſolution of it.

SECT. II.

The principle or ground on which they goe for Reſiſtance, examined by Scripture. Their chiefe examples. Scriptures againſt them; eſpecially that of the 13 *to the* Romanes, *urged and cleared: where ſhewed, The King is that higher Power. That all are forbidden to reſiſt, even the Senate, which by the fundamentals of that State might challenge as much as our great Councell can. That prohibition concernes all times; and was good, not onely in that State, becauſe they were abſolute Monarches; but in all States, becauſe of the preſervation of Order which ſhould be in all; and was good not onely againſt the Chriſtians, becauſe their Religion was enacted againſt by Law, but alſo againſt the Senate and People, though they were enſlaved.*

SECT. III.

Their principle examined by reaſon. Of Fundamentalls, their groundworke according to the pleaders for reſiſtance, is the originall of Power from the People; and their reaſſuming it, when the Prince will not diſcharge his truſt.

The Power it ſelfe (diſtinguiſhed from the deſigning of the Perſon, and the Qualifications of it in ſeverall formes of Government) is from God as an ordinance or conſtitution under that providence whereby God rules the whole world; Creatures reaſonable as well as unreaſonable.

SECT. IV.

That Power cannot be forfeited to the People, or reaſſumed by them. They cannot prove it by virtue of the firſt election, or by any capitulation or covenant, or the oath betweene Prince and People.

SECT. V.

SECT. V.

Nor can it be proved by that neceſſity of meanes of ſafety which ſhould be in every State to provide for it ſelfe: but greater dangers and inconveniencies would follow by ſuch meanes of ſafety as are pretended to by reſuming the Power.

SECT. VI.

The Examination of the Reſiſtance now made. Where ſhewne, that it is not ſuch as they themſelves pretend to, who plead for it; either for the generall and unanimous conſent of the Kingdome; for it was not ſo agreed upon: or for the defenſive way of it, becauſe the King is upon the defenſive; For he was not firſt in Armes, and the Contention muſt needs appeare to be for ſomething the King hath right to hold, or is bound by oath to maintaine. Alſo becauſe to any mans conſcience it will appeare to be an oppugnation, rather then an aſſiſtance or meere defence.

SECT. VII.

The Caſe is not in being. No Conſcience can conclude the King to be, what they would have him ſuppoſed; becauſe the jealouſies are groundleſſe. The King hath done ſufficient to cleare them, by Promiſes, Proteſtations, Acts of Grace. And Conſcience, if it hold the rule of Charity, will not againſt all thoſe conclude contrary intentions in him, upon them to ground reſiſtance; but will, if it will not be partiall, judge the King hath offered ſuch reaſonable meanes of ſecurity to this State, as ought to have beene apprehended, rather then this Kingdome embroyled in a Civill warre, and Ireland *neglected. Laſtly, a Conſcience that concludes for reſiſtance, wants the perſwaſion of faith, and the judgement of charity in an high meaſure, and cannot appeare ſafely at Gods Tribunall.*

¶ The Resolving of Conscience,

Touching the unlawfulnesse of the VVarre, and Resistance now made against the KING.

LAmentable are the distractions of this Kingdome, and the more, because they gather strength from the name and authority of (that, which as it is of high esteeme with all, so should it be a remedy to all these our distempers) a Parliament: and from the pretended defence of those things that are most deare unto us, Religion, Liberties, Lawes. Whereupon so many good people, that have come to a sense of religion and godlinesse, are miserably carried away by a strange implicite faith to believe, whatsoever is said or done in the name of a Parliament, and in the pretended defence of Religion, Liberties, Lawes, to be infallibly true, and altogether just.

But he that will consider, men are men, and would seeke a surer rule for his conscience then the Traditions or Ordinances of men taken hand over head, shall upon reasonable examination finde upon what plausible but groundlesse principles, upon what faire but deceiving pretences, upon what grievous but causelesse imputations laid upon Majestie it selfe, poore people are drawne into Armes against the duty and allegeance they owe to their Prince by the Laws of God and man. For directing the Conscience in such an examination this ensuing Discourse is framed, as briefly and plainly as the matter will permit.

SECT. I.

CONscience in resolving upon a question, first layes downe the Proposition, or Principle, or Ground on which it goes; then it assumes or applyes to the present case; then it concludes and resolves: as in this question, affirmatively for Resistance, thus, Subjects in such a case may Arme and Resist: But that case is now come: Therefore now they may and doe justly Resist.

Or negatively against Resistance, either by denying the Principle: Subjects may not in such a case Arme and Resist; therefore now they doe not justly Resist. Or by admitting the Principle and denying the Case; Subjects in such a case may Arme and Resist. But that case is not now. Therefore now they doe not justly Arme and Resist.

What it is that Conscience is here to admit or deny, and how it ought to conclude and resolve, this ensuing Treatise will discover: which that it may more clearely appeare, we will premise,

First, That in the Proposition or Principle by the word *Resistance* is meant, not a denying of obedience to the Princes command, but a rising in Armes, a forcible Resistance; this though cleare enough in the question, yet I thought fit to insinuate, to take off that false imputation laid upon the Divines of this Kingdome; and upon all those that appeare for the King in this cause, that they endeavour to defend an absolute power in him, and to raise him to an Arbitrary way of Government; This we are as much against on his part, as against Resistance on the Subjects part. For we may and ought to deny obedience to such commands of the Prince, as are unlawfull by the Law of God, yea, by the established Lawes of the Land: For in these we have his will and consent given upon good advice, and to obey him against the Lawes were to obey him against himselfe, his suddain will against his deliberate will; but a farre other matter it is to Resist by power of Armes, as is in the question implyed; and as we see at this day to our astonishment, first the power of Armes taken from the Prince by setting up the *Militia*, then that power used against him by an Army in the field.

Secondly, We must consider, that they which plead for Resistance in such a case as is supposed, doe grant it must be concluded upon,

Omnibus

Omnibus Ordinibus regni consentientibus, that is, with the generall and unanimous consent of the Members of the two Houses, the representative body of the whole Kingdome: also they yeild it must be onely *Legitima defensio*, a meere defensive resistance; and this also Conscience must take notice of.

Thirdly, It is considerable, that in the supposition or case it is likewise granted by them, that the Prince must first be so and so disposed, and bent to overthrow Religion, Liberties, Lawes, and will not discharge his trust for the maintaining of them, before such a Resistance can be pretended to. And although the question is, and must be so put now, as that it seems to straiten the Case, and make it depend upon the supposall of the people; yet it so much the more enlarges the falsehood of the Principle, for it plainly speaks thus; If Subjects believe, or verily suppose their Prince will change Religion, they may rise in Armes; whereas all that have pleaded for Resistance in case of Religion, did suppose another Religion enjoyned upon the Subject first. We will therefore endeavour to cleare all for the resolving of Conscience in these three generalls:

I. That no Conscience upon such a case as is supposed can finde cleare ground to rest upon for such Resistance as is pretended to, but according to the rules of Conscience, *What is not of faith is sinne*: And, *In doubtfull things the safer way is to be chosen*; Conscience it will finde cause to forbeare and to suffer, rather then resist; *doubtfull*, I say, not that a Conscience truly informed will not clearely see the unlawfulnesse of this Resistance, but because no conscience can be truly perswaded of the lawfulnesse of it, and so that Conscience that resolves for it, must needes runne doubtingly or blindely upon the worke.

II. That the Resistance now used and made against the Prince is not such as they pretend to, either for that generall and unanimous consent that should precede it, or that defensive way that should accompany it, according to their owne grants that plead for it, and therefore Conscience cannot admit such a Resistance as is made now adayes.

III. If Conscience could be perswaded that it is lawfull in such a case to Resist, and that this rising in Armes is such a Resistance as they say may in such a case be pretended to, yet can it never (if it be willing

ling to know any thing) be truly perswaded that such a case is now come, that is, That the King refuses to discharge his trust, is bent to overthrow Religion, &c. and therefore Conscience cannot but resolve, this Opposition and Resistance to be unlawfull, unwarrantable, and (according to the Apostle) damnable; and that people, running into Armes without sufficient warrant, commit murder if they shed bloud in the pursuit of this Resistance, and perish in their owne sinne, if die in the cause.

SECT. II.

First then, that the Principle is untrue upon which they goe that Resist, and that Conscience cannot finde cleare ground to rest upon for making Resistance: for it heares the Apostle expressely say,
Rom. 13. 2 *Whosoever resist shall receive to themselves damnation*: and it cannot finde any limitation in Scripture that will excuse the Resistance of these dayes.

The exception or limitation that is made, is taken from the Persons resisting, and the Causes of resistance, thus, They that are private Persons, and doe resist upon any cause, receive damnation; but the States or representative body of the whole people, may resist upon such or such causes.

But how will this satisfie Conscience, when every distinction or limitation made upon any place of Scripture, must have its ground in Scripture? this ha's onely some examples in Scripture that come not home to the Cause, and some appearances of Reason; which are easily refuted by clearer Scripture and Reason.

1 Sam. 14. The examples alledged are, I. The peoples rescuing of *Jonathan* out of the hands of *Saul*. *Answer.* Here the people drew not into Armes of themselves, but being there at *Sauls* command, did by a loving violence and importunity hinder the execution of a particular and passionate unlawfull command.

II. *Davids* resisting of *Saul*. *Answer* 1. *Davids* guard that he had about him was onely to secure his person against the cut-throats of *Saul*, if sent to take away his life. 2. It was a meere defence without all violence offered to *Saul*; therefore he still gave place as *Saul* pursued, and did no act of hostility to him or any of his Army when they

they were in his power, 1 *Sam.* 26. But thirdly, because they gather out of the 1 *Sam.* 23. 12. that *David* would have defended *Keilah* against *Saul*, if the Inhabitants would have beene faithfull to him. We say that's onely an uncertaine supposition, not fit to ground Conscience in this great point of Resistance. Nay, it seemes cleare to the contrary, that he made that inquiry with intention not of defending the Citie upon their faithfulnesse to him, but of speedy providing for his flight upon knowledge of their unfaithfulnesse, that he might not be shut up in a Citie, that, as it's noted in the Text, *had gates and bars*. Also to this and all other *Davids* demeanours, in his standing out against *Saul*, we say his example was extraordinary; for he was anointed and designed by the Lord to succeed *Saul*, and without doubt had warrant to use an extraordinary way of safeguarding his person.

These are the chiefe examples. They make use also of the high Priests resisting the King in the Temple, and *Elisha's* shutting the doore against the Kings Messenger that came to take away his head, and the like; which speake not so much as the two former, having no appearance of such resistance as is implyed in the question. 2 Chro. 26.

But we answer, 1. That of the high Priest is more pertinently applyed to the Popes power of excommunicating and deposing Kings, then to this power of resisting now used; but truly to neither. For he did no more then what every Minister may and ought to doe, if a King should attempt the administration of the Sacrament; that is, to reprove him, to keepe the Elements from him. *Ambrose*, Bishop of *Milan* withstood the Emperour at the entrance of Gods house, not by Excommunication, much lesse by force of Armes, but by letting him understand he was not fit for that place, there to be made partaker of the holy things, till he had repented of that outrage and bloudshed at *Thessalonica*. Upon which the Emperour withdrew.

The Priests here are said to thrust the King out of the Temple, but we must note Gods hand was first upon him, smiting him with leprousie; and by that discharging him of the Kingdome also. It is added in the Text, *yea himselfe also hasted to goe out*. But enough of this.

2. *Elisha's* example speaks very little. But let us thence take occasion to say, That Personall defence is lawfull against the sudden and illegall assaults of such Messengers, yea of the Prince himselfe thus farre, to ward his blowes, to hold his hands, and the like; not to put

danger

danger his person, not to returne blowes; no, for though it be naturall to defend a mans selfe, yet the whole Common-wealth is concerned in his person, as we see in the Common-wealth of the creatures, one particular nature will defend it selfe against another, but yeild to the universall.

If this be drawne from Personall defence to the publike resistance now used, as usually they make the Argument thus: If the body naturall, then the body politick may defend it selfe; if a private person, much more the whole State may; and they doe but shut the way up against the King that comes to destroy his Parliament, and take away their heads.

We answer: As the naturall body defends it selfe against an outward force, but strives not by a schisme or contention within it selfe; so may the body politick against an outward power, but not as now by one part of it set against the Head, and another part of the same body; for that tends to the dissolution of the whole. Againe: Personall defence may be without all offence, and does not strike at the order and power that is over us, as generall resistance by Armes doth, which cannot be without many unjust violences, and does immediately strike at that order which is the life of the Common-wealth. And this makes a large difference 'twixt *Elisha's* shutting the doore against this Messenger, and their shutting up the way against the King by Armed men; nor can they conclude upon such an intention in the Kings heart, without the Spirit of *Elisha*. He professeth he intends no violence to his Parliament, nor hath he taken away the head of any of theirs that have fallen into his power, nor does desire any other punishment inflicted upon any that doe oppose him, then what a Legall triall shall adjudge them to, which no good Subject ought to decline.

Lastly, they urge the example of *Libnah*, which revolted from the King of *Judah*, because he had forsaken the Lord; 2 *Chron.* cap. 21. v. 10. but it is impertinent as all the rest are, for it neither proves the principle, That it is lawfull for the People to revolt when the King forsakes Religion, but shewes that such a revolt is a punishment from God upon such a King, though a sinne in the People: Nor doth it come home to the Case, for there the King had forsaken; here is onely supposall that he will, and that groundlesse, as will appeare in the end of this Treatise.

Now

Now let us ſee how Scripture excludes this and all other exceptions, giving no allowance to Reſiſtance, in regard of Perſons, or Cauſes, or other pretences; and this not onely by Examples, but by Precept, Concluſions, Reſolutions, which are more ſafe.

Firſt, We have the two hundred and fifty Princes of the Congregation, gathering the people againſt *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Numb.* 16. 3. and periſhing in their ſinne. If it be replied, the Perſons indeed were publike, but there was no cauſe for it; *Moſes* and *Aaron* did not deſerve it. I anſwer, but the other ſuppoſed they did, and that is now enough, it ſeemes, to make people not onely ſay to their Prince, *You take too much upon you*, but therefore to riſe in Armes alſo; which I hope will appeare to be without cauſe too in the end of this Treatiſe.

Secondly, See for the cauſe of Reſiſtance, 1 *Sam.* 8. 11. there the people are let to underſtand how they ſhould be oppreſſed under Kings, yet all that violence and injuſtice that ſhould be done unto them is no juſt cauſe of reſiſtance, for they have no remedy left them but crying to the Lord, *v.* 18.

Thirdly, We have not onely Example, but Reſolution and Concluſion out of Scripture. The people might not be gathered together either for Civill Aſſemblies, or for Warre, but by his command that had the power of the Trumpet; that is, the ſupreame, as *Moſes* was, *Numb.* 10.

Alſo when *David* had *Saul* and his Army in his power, he reſolves the matter thus; *Who can ſtreteh out his hand againſt the Lords anointed and be guiltleſſe*, 1 *Sam.* 26. 9. If replied, now they intend not hurt to the Kings Perſon; yet might not they as well have hurt His Perſon in the day of battaile, as any of them that were ſwept away from about Him by the fury of the Ordnance, which puts no difference twixt Kings and common Souldiers? Their uſuall excuſe, that they intend theſe Armes onely againſt the *Cavaleirs* and *Malignants* about the King, will no more ſave them from the guilt, then it will do Him from the violence.

This alſo I muſt obſerve concerning this point of Reſiſtance out of the Old Teſtament, (for from thence have they all their ſeeming inſtances) That it is a marvellous thing, that amongſt ſo many Prophets reprehending the Kings of *Iſrael* and *Judah* for idolatry, cruelty, oppreſſion, none ſhould call upon the Elders of the people for this duty of Reſiſtance.

But lastly, that place of the Apostle, *Rom.* 13. at first mentioned, does above all give us a cleare resolution upon the point, which now I shall free from all exceptions.

First, I may suppose, that the King is the *Supreme*, as S. *Peter* calls him; or *the higher Power*, as S. *Paul* here, though it be by some now put to the question, as one absurdity commonly begets another to defend it: but I prove it: S. *Peters* distinction comprehends all that are in authority, *The King as Supreme, and those that are sent by him*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 12. in which latter ranke are the two Houses of Parliament, being sent by Him, or sent for by Him, and by His Writ sitting there. Also by the Oath of Supremacy it is acknowledged, That there is no power above him without or within this Realme; and that he is in all Causes and over all Persons Supreme. Also acknowledged by the Petitions of the two Houses addressed unto His Majestie, wherein they stile themselves *His loyall Subjects*. But enough of this.

Secondly, In the Text of the Apostle, All persons under the higher power are expressely forbidden to resist. For *whosoever*, in the second verse, must be as large as the *every soule* in the first; and the Resistance forbidden here concernes all, upon whom the subjection is injoyned there, or else we could not make these Universals good against the Papists, excepting the Pope and Clergy from the subjection.

Thirdly, In those dayes there was a standing and continuall great Senate, which not long before had the supreme power in the *Romane* State, and might challenge more by the Fundamentalls of that State, then the great Councell of this Kingdome (I thinke) will, or can. But now the Emperour being *Supreme*, as S. *Peter* calls him; or the *higher power*, as S. *Paul* here, there is no power of resistance left to any that are under him, by the Apostle. This for the persons that should resist, all are forbidden. Now consider the Cause.

Fourthly, Was there ever more cause of resistance then in those dayes? Were not the Kings then not onely conceived to be inclined so and so, but even actually were enemies to Religion, had overthrowne Lawes and Liberties? and therefore if any should from the Apostles reasons that he gives against Resistance in the 3, 4, 5 verses, (*For Rulers are not a terrour to good workes but evill, and he is the Minister of God to thee for good*) reply, That Rulers so long as they are not a terrour to the good, but minister for our good, are not to be resisted: the consideration of those times leaves no place for such exception,

ception, becauſe the Powers then (which the Apoſtle forbids to reſiſt) were nothing ſo, but ſubverters of that which was good and juſt.

If it be replied, That prohibition was temporary and fit for thoſe times, as it is ſaid by ſome. I anſwer, 1. This is a new exception never heard of (I thinke) but in theſe times. 2. It is groundleſſe, and againſt the Text, for the reaſons of the prohibition in the 3,4,5,6 verſes are perpetuall, from that order, that good, for which the Powers are ordained of God, which will be of force as long as there is government, and will alwayes be reaſons againſt reſiſtance; becauſe reſiſtance (though it be made againſt abuſed powers as then they were) doth tend to the diſſolution of that order, for which the power it ſelfe is ſet up of God. By which alſo that other diſtinction of theirs is made void, when as they reply, as they thinke, acutely, That they reſiſt not the power, but the abuſe of the power.

It is alſo anſwered by ſome, that the Emperours then were abſolute Monarchs, and therefore not to be reſiſted. I anſwer, They did indeed rule abſolutely and arbitrarily, which ſhould have, according to the principles of theſe dayes, beene a ſtronger motive to reſiſt. But how did they make themſelves of Subjects ſuch abſolute Monarchs? was it not by force and change of the government? and was not the right of the people and Senate, (according to the Principles of theſe dayes) good againſt them with as much or more reaſon, then the right of the people of this Land is againſt the ſucceſſion of this Crown deſcending by ſeverall Conqueſts? And this I ſpeake not to win an Arbitrary power, or ſuch as Conquerours uſe, unto this Crowne; but onely to ſhew, that Reſiſtance can be no more made againſt the Kings of *England*, then it could againſt thoſe Emperours. Nay, with leſſe reaſon againſt them, then thoſe.

Laſtly, it is replied, That Chriſtian Religion was then enacted againſt by Law; but the Religion contended for is eſtabliſhed by Law. I anſwer: But is the Religion eſtabliſhed denied to any that now fight for it? Shall the Apoſtles prohibition be good againſt Chriſtians in the behalfe of actuall Tyrants perſecuting that Religion, and not againſt Subjects freely enjoying the Religion eſtabliſhed? Or may Proteſtants upon a jealouſie reſiſt a Proteſtant King profeſſing the ſame Religion, and promiſing to conſerve it entire to them?

2. The prohibition doth not onely concerne Christians, but all the people under those Emperours; and not onely Religion was persecuted, but Liberties also lost, the people and Senate were enslaved by Edicts and Lawes then inforced upon them, and they (according to the principles of these dayes) might resist, notwithstanding the Apostles prohibition, and the Lawes then forced upon them; or else the State, as they usually say, had not meanes to provide for its safety. Thus one phansie of theirs thwarts another, because both are groundlesse. But more anon of those meanes of safety they suppose to be in every State, by the power of Resistance.

Hitherto of Scripture, which is most powerfull against Resistance, in the prohibition and the reasons of it, by which Conscience will clearly see, it can have no warrant from Scripture for Resistance. Now let us try what Reason can enforce.

SECT. III.

FOr proving this Power of Resistance, there is much speech used about Fundamentalls of this government, which because they lie low, and unseene by vulgar eyes, being not written Lawes, the people are easily made to believe they are such as they (that have power to build new Lawes upon them) say they are. And indeed none so fit to judge of them as they: Yet this we know, that the authority of the three Estates is required, as for the making, so for the binding Declaration of Law; and every one that can use his reason knowes, that the Fundamentalls must needs be such as will beare the settled government of this Land, such as are not contradictory to the written established Lawes: but both the government we see used in this Land, and the written Lawes which we reade, must have a correspondency and analogie of reason to these Fundamentalls, and these to them.

Well then, they that plead for Power of Resistance in the people, lay the first ground-worke of their Fundamentalls thus: Power is originally in and from the people, and if when by election they have intrusted a Prince with the power, he will not discharge his trust, then it falls to the people; or, as in this Kingdome, to the two Houses of Parliament (the representative body of the people) to see to it; they may re-assume the power.

This

This is the bottome of their Fundamentalls, as they are now diſcovered to the people. But here we may take notice by the way, that however the Fundamentalls of this Government are much talked of, this is according to their reaſon) the Fundamentall in all Kingdomes and Governments; for they ſay, power was every where from the people at firſt, and ſo this will ſerve no more for the power of Reſiſtance in *England*, then in *France*, or *Turkie*: but if this muſt be a Fundamentall, it is ſuch an one as upon it this Government cannot be built, but Confuſion and Anarchy may readily be raiſed; as ſhall appeare by the clearing of theſe two particulars: Whether the Power be ſo originally and chiefly from the people as they would have it; then, Whether they may upon ſuch cauſes re-aſſume that power.

Firſt, of the originall of power, which they will have ſo from the people, that it ſhall be from God onely by a kinde of permiſſive approbation, as we may ſee by the Obſervatour, and all other that plead for this Power of Reſiſtance. We muſt here diſtinguiſh what the Writers of the other ſide ſeeme to confound, to wit, *the Power* it ſelfe, (which is a ſufficiency of authority for command and coercion in the governing of a people) from the *deſigning of the Perſon* to beare that power, and the *qualification* of that power according to the divers wayes of executing it in ſeverall formes of Government; and then we grant, that the deſigning of the Perſon is ſometimes from the people by choice; and that the power of the Prince receiving qualification by joynt conſent of himſelfe and the people, is limited by the Lawes made with ſuch conſent; but the power it ſelfe is of God originally and chiefly: which we prove by Scripture and Reaſon.

Firſt, by ſuch places of Scripture, as plainly ſhew an ordaining and appointing, rather then a permiſſion or approbation:

1. The Apoſtle ſpeakes it expreſſely, *The powers are of God*, Rom. 13. 1. and, *the ordinance of God*, v. 2. S. *Peter* indeed ſaith, *every ordinance of man*, 1 Epiſt. 2. but *of man* there, and of *God* here, is much differing; there it is ἀνθρωπίνη, of man, *ſubjectivè*, that is, every ordinance or power ſet up amongſt men; but here it is διὰ Θεοῦ, of God, *cauſaliter*, that is, from him, his ordinance; and if in that ἀνθρωπίνη there be implyed any creation, or cauſality, or invention of man, it reſpects the qualification of the power, according to the formes of ſeverall governments and offices in them, which are from the invention of man;

it doth not make the power it selfe the creation of man, which is the constitution and ordinance of God; and men are not onely naturally bent to society, but also are bound as they are reasonable creatures, to set up and live under government, as under an order of that providence by which the world is governed.

II. He is called the *Minister of God*, v. 4. but if so from the people, and no otherwise from God then they would have him, he should be *Minister populi* rather; he is indeed their Minister for their good, which makes the people to be the end of this governing power, not the fountaine and originall of it: therefore the necessity of subjection urged in the 5. *v.* hath a double ground, *The ordinance of God*, whose ministers Rulers are, there's the fountaine and originall of Power to governe; then *the Peoples good* upon which Rulers ought to attend, that's an end of the Governing power.

III. To the same purpose speake those other places, *By me Kings reigne*: And, *I have said ye are Gods*, *Psal.* 82. in relation to which our Saviour saith, *Joh.* 10. *They are called Gods to whom the word of God came*; that *dixi*, that *word* is the command, the issuing out as it were of the commission for the setting up of a governing power among the people.

These places cannot be satisfied with that poore part, they on the other side leave to God in the setting up of power for the governing of men; that is, to approve it when the people hath created or invented it. Indeed, if we consider the qualifications of this governing power, and the manner of executing it according to the severall formes of government, we granted it before to be the invention of man, and when such a qualification or forme is orderly agreed upon, we say it hath Gods permissive approbation.

And therefore the imputation is causeleſſe which the Pleaders on the other side doe heedlesly and ignorantly lay upon us Divines, as if we cryed up Monarchy, and that onely government to be *jure divino*. For although Monarchy hath this excellencie, that the government God set up over his people in the person of *Moses*, the Judges, and the Kings was Monarchicall; yet we confesse that neither that, nor Aristocracy, or any other forme is *jure divino*: but we say the power it selfe, or that sufficiency of Authority to governe, which is in Monarchie or Aristocracie, abstractly considered from the qualifications of either forme,

is an efflux or conſtitution ſubordinate to that providence, an ordinance of that *Dixi*, that ſilent *Word* by which the world was at firſt made, and is ſtill governed under God.

Secondly, as this appeares by the former places of Scripture, ſo is it alſo ſuitable to Reaſon: Becauſe God doth governe all creatures, Reaſonable as well as Unreaſonable; the inferiour or lower world he governes by the heavens or ſuperiour bodies, according to thoſe influences and powers he hath put into them; and the reaſonable creatures, Men, he governes too by others ſet up in his ſtead over them; for which they are called *Gods*, becauſe in his ſtead over the people: and the powers are ſaid to be, not onely ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, *from God*; but alſo τεταγμέναι, as orders ranked by him, and under him too, ſubordinate to that providence by which all creatures are governed.

Theſe his Miniſters he ſometimes deſigned immediately by himſelfe, as *Moſes*, the *Judges*, *Saul*, *David*, &c. Now he deſignes his Vicegerents on earth mediately, as by election of the people, by ſucceſſion or inheritance, by conqueſt, &c. To conclude, The power it ſelfe of government is of God; however the perſon be deſigned, or that power qualified according to the ſeverall formes of government by thoſe Lawes that are eſtabliſhed, or thoſe grants that are procured for the peoples ſecurity. Thus much of the originall of Power.

SECT. IV.

NOw we come to the Forfeiture, as I may call it, of this power. If the Prince, ſay they, will not diſcharge his truſt, then it falls to the people, or the two Houſes (the repreſentative body of the people) to ſee to it, and to reaſſume that power, and thereby to reſiſt. This they conceive to follow upon the *derivation of power* from the people by virtue of election; and upon the *ſtipulation or covenant* of the Prince with the people, as alſo to be neceſſary in regard of thoſe *meanes of ſafety*, which every State ſhould have within it ſelfe. We will examine them in order, and ſhall finde the arguments inconſequent.

Concerning the derivation of power, we anſwer; Firſt, if it be not from the people, as they will have it, and as before it was cleared, then can there be no reaſſuming of this power by the people; that's plaine by their owne argument. Secondly,

Secondly, if the people ſhould give the power ſo abſolutely as they would have it, leaving nothing to God in it but approbation, yet could they not therefore have right to take that power away. For many things which are altogether in our diſpoſing before we part with them, are not afterward in our power to recall; eſpecially ſuch in which there redounds to God an intereſt by the donation, as in things devoted, though afterward they come to be abuſed. So although it were, as they would have it, that they give the power, and God approves; yet becauſe the Lords hand alſo and his oyle is upon the perſon elected to the Crowne, and then he is the Lords anointed, and the miniſter of God, thoſe hands of the people which were uſed in lifting him up to the Crowne, may not againe be lifted up againſt him, either to take the Crowne from his head, or the Sword out of his hand. This will not a true informed Conſcience dare to doe.

Thirdly, How ſhall the Conſcience be ſatisfied, that this their argument grounded upon election, and the derivation of power from the people, can have place in this Kingdome, when as the Crowne not onely deſcends by inheritance, but alſo hath beene ſettled by Conqueſt in the lines of *Saxons* and *Normans*? In anſwering to this they looke beyond theſe, and ſay, the right is ſtill good to the people by reaſon of their firſt election. I anſwer: So then that firſt election muſt be ſuppoſed here, and ſuppoſed good againſt all other titles, or elſe this power of Reſiſtance falls to the ground. It is probable that Kings at firſt were by choice here as elſewhere among the Heathens; but can Conſcience reſt upon ſuch remote probabilities for Reſiſtance, or thinke that firſt election will give it power againſt Princes that doe not claime by it. We tell them the *Romane* Emperours were not to be reſiſted, *Rom.* 13. 2. They reply, as we had it above, that they were abſolute Monarchs. But how came they of Subjects to be abſolute Monarchs? was it any otherwiſe then by force and armes, the way that the *Saxons* and *Normans* made themſelves Maſters of this people? and was not the right of the people as good againſt them for the power of reſiſtance, by virtue of the firſt election, as well as of the people of this Land againſt their Kings, after ſo many Conqueſts? This I ſpeake, not as if the Kings of this Land might rule as Conquerours: God forbid. But to ſhew this ſlender plea of the firſt election can no more take place againſt the Kings of this Land, then it could

againſt

againſt the *Romane* Monarchs, eſpecially according to their argument, that hold all power originally from the people, and that (as we obſerved above) to be the fundamentall of all Government. Therefore whether Kings were in this Land at firſt by election or no; we acknowledge what belongs to the duty of a Prince in doing juſtice and equity, what Grants alſo, Lawes, Priviledges, have ſince thoſe conqueſts been procured, or reſtored unto the people, unto all thoſe the King is bound; but yet not bound under forfeiture of his power to the people: which now comes to be examined in that capitulation or covenant he is ſaid to enter with the people.

In the next place therefore, That Capitulation or Covenant, and the Oath which the Prince takes to confirme what he promiſeth, are ſo alleadged, as if the breach of non-performance on the Princes part, were a forfeiture of his power. But we anſwer, The word *capitulation* or *covenant* are now much uſed to make men beleeve the Kings admittance to the Crowne is altogether conditionall, as in the meerely elective Kingdomes of *Polonia*, *Swedeland*, &c. whereas our King is King before he comes to the Coronation, which is ſooner or later at his pleaſure, but alwaies to be in due time in regard of that ſecurity his people receive by his taking the oath, and he againe mutually from them, in which performance there is ſomething like a covenant, all but the forfeiture. The King there promiſes, and binds himſelf by oath to performance. Could they in this covenant ſhew us ſuch an agreement betweene the King and His People, that in caſe he will not diſcharge his truſt, then it ſhall be lawfull for the States of the Kingdome by Armes to reſiſt, and provide for the ſafety thereof, it were ſomething; but not ſufficient in my opinion, to give conſcience warrant for reſiſtance; ſuch conditions being altogether unreaſonable.

If it be ſaid, that ſo much is implied in the firſt election. We anſwer: We examined that ſlender plea of the firſt election above, as it was thought to be a derivation of power. Now as it is thought to have a Covenant in it; we ſay, That uſually in all Empires, the higher we goe, the more free and abſolute we finde Kings to have beene, and ſtill downewards the people have gained upon them: For at firſt when people choſe their Rulers, they did, as *Juſtine* in the beginning of his Hiſtory obſerves, reſigne themſelves to be governed by ſuch, of whoſe prudence and moderation they had experience; and then, *Ar-*

bitria Principum pro legibus erant, the will and diſcretion of the Prince was law unto the people; but men were men though in Gods place, and therefore for the reſtraint of that power, with conſent of the Prince ſuch Lawes have beene ſtill procured by the people, as might make for their ſecurity.

Now from a promiſe the King makes for doing juſtice (the duty of every Prince) for the continuing thoſe priviledges, immunities, that have beene granted or reſtored to the people, and for the obſerving of thoſe Lawes that have beene eſtabliſhed with the Princes conſent, and from that oath (by which for the greater ſecurity of the people he bindes himſelfe to the performance of the premiſes) to infer a great obligation lieth upon him, is right: but to gather thence a forfeiture of his power upon the not performance, is a plaine but dangerous inconſequent argument.

And though ſuch argument may ſeeme to have ſome force in States meerely elective and pactionall, yet can it never be made to appeare to any indifferent underſtanding, that the like muſt obtaine in this Kingdome. And to this purpoſe *Phil. Pareus* excuſeth what his father had written more harſhly upon the 13. to the *Romanes*, in the point of reſiſtance, that it was to be underſtood of elective and pactionall government, not to the prejudice of *England*, or ſuch Monarchies. For where the King, as it is ſaid, never dies, where he is King before Oath or Coronation, where he is not admitted upon any ſuch capitulation as gives any power to the people, or their repreſentative body, as is pretended to: Nay, where that body cannot meet but by the will of the Prince, and is diſſoluble at his pleaſure; that there, in ſuch a State, ſuch a power ſhould be pretended to, and uſed againſt the Prince as at this day; and that according to the Fundamentalls of ſuch a State, can never appeare reaſonable to any indifferent judgement, much leſſe ſatisfie Conſcience in the reſiſtance that is now made by ſuch a pretended power.

What then ſhall we ſay? Is the King not bound to performe? Yes, by all meanes. Or hath he not a limited power according to the Lawes? Yes. What then if he will take to himſelfe more power, or not performe what he is bound to? Suppoſe that, (though thankes be to God we are not come to that) then may the Subjects uſe all faire meanes as are fit to uſe, cries to God, petitions to the Prince, denialls

of

of obedience to his unlawfull commands, denialls of ſubſidy, aid, &c. But are they left without all means to compell by force and reſiſtance? This however it may at firſt ſight ſeeme unreaſonable to the people, and very impolitick to the Stateſman, yet hath Scripture forbidden it, as before was plainly ſhewed, and ſo doth Reaſon too, as will appeare in the examination of their laſt proofe they make for re-aſſuming this power and reſiſting, from that neceſſity of meanes of ſafety, which every State is to have within it ſelfe: Of which now.

SECT. V.

IN the laſt place it is thus reaſoned, Were it not ſo that the two Houſes might take and uſe this power, the State ſhould not have meanes to provide for it's owne ſafety; when the King ſhall pleaſe to deſert His Parliament, deny His conſent to their Bills, abuſe His Power, &c. So they.

When right and juſt will not defend a cauſe, then Neceſſity is uſually pleaded; as if, becauſe *Salus populi* in a good ſenſe is *Suprema lex*, everything muſt be honeſt, which is *Spiritus utile*, imagined to conduce to the propoſed end. We anſwer therefore,

Firſt, They have many weapons ſharpened for this reſiſtance at the *Philiſtims* forge, arguments borrowed from the *Romane* Shooles; among them this is one, the very reaſon that is made for the Popes power of curbing or depoſing Kings in caſe of Hereſie. For if there be not that power in the Church, ſay they, then in caſe the Civill Magiſtrate will not diſcharge his truſt, the Church hath not meanes for the maintenance of the Catholick faith and its owne ſafety. Well, as we reply to them, the Church hath meanes of preſerving the faith, ſuch as God hath appointed, though not that of one viſible Head, which though at firſt ſeemes plauſible for preſerving the Unity of faith, yet hath experience ſhewne it, to be indeed the meanes to bring much miſchiefe upon the Church: So to the other we ſay, The State hath meanes of preſervation, ſuch as the Law hath preſcribed, though not ſuch as are here pretended to in this power of reſiſtance; which though ſeemingly plauſible, yet true reaſon will conclude them dangerous, and at this day, God knowes we ſee it. Of this in the fourth anſwer more particularly.

Secondly, If every State ha's such meanes to provide for its safety, what meanes of safety had the Christian Religion under the Romane Emperours in and after the Apostles times? or the people then inslaved, what meanes had they for their Liberties? had they this of resistance? Tertullian, in his Apol. sayes, the Christians had number & force sufficient to withstand, but they had no warrant; & the Apostle expressely forbids them, and all other under the higher power, to resist.

If it be replied, as it was above touched, That things being so enacted by Law, it was not lawfull for them to rest. I answer: But it is knowne that not onely those Edicts which concerned Christian religion, but also all other that proceeded from those Emperors and enslaved the people, were merely arbitrary and enforced upon the Senate, & that the Senate did not discharge their trust in consenting to them, and therefore according to the former position the people might resist, notwithstanding the Apostles prohibition, or els no means of safety left in that State.

So would it be in this State, if at any time a King that would rule arbitrarily, as those Emperours did, should by some meanes or other worke out of the two Houses the better affected, and by the Consent of the Major part of them that remain, compasse his desires; might the people then resist? The Apostle forbids it to them as well as to the Romanes in such a case: if so, where are these meanes of safety by this power of resistance? Or are these meanes of safety extinct in the Consent of the Senate, or the two Houses? No, the people will tell them they discharge not their trust, they chose them not to betray them, enslave them; but according to the principles now taught them, they might lay hold upon this power of resistance, for their representative body claimes it by them.

Thirdly we answer, We cannot expect absolute meanes of safety and security in a State, but such as are reasonable; and such are provided, especially in the fundamentals of this Government, by that excellent temper of the three estates in Parliament, there being a power of denying in each of them, and no power of enacting in one or two of them without the third; which as it is for the security of the Common-wealth (for what might follow if the King and Lords without the Commons, or these and the Lords without the King, might determine, the evils of these dayes do shew) so is this power of denying

ing, for the ſecurity of each Eſtate againſt the other, of the Commons againſt the King and Lords, of the Lords againſt them: and muſt the King truſt onely, and not be truſted? Muſt not he alſo have his ſecurity againſt the other, which he cannot have but by power of denying? This is that Temper of the three Eſtates in Parliament, the due obſerving whereof, in the moderate uſe of this Power of denying, is the reaſonable meanes of this States ſafety: But now not onely the name of Parliament, which implies the three Eſtates, is reſtrained uſually to the two Houſes, but alſo that Temper is diſſolved. I need not ſpeak it, the diſtractions and convulſions of the whole Commonwealth, as the diſtempers in a naturall body, do ſufficiently ſhew ſuch a diſſolution, and what's the cauſe of it?

If it be replyed, as it is, for the reaſonableneſſe of theſe meanes of ſafety, through that Power of reſiſtance and the ſmall truſt repoſed in the repreſentative body of the people, That many ſee more than one, and more ſafety in the judgement of many, then of one. *Anſw.* True. But 1. Conſcience might here demand for its ſatisfaction, Why ſhould an hundred in the Houſe of Commons ſee more than three hundred; or twenty in the Lords Houſe, more then ſixty that are withdrawn or of different judgement.

2. Reaſon doth ſuppoſe, That the Prince, though one, ſees with the eyes of many, yea with their eyes who are of different judgement from him, for which his Houſes of Parliament are his great Councell to preſent to his eyes the differences of things with the reaſons of them; and albeit he ſometimes diſſents from the Major or prevailing part, becauſe he is convinced in his owne judgement they ſeek themſelves not his or the publick good, or for other reaſons that may perſwade him againſt their Vote, yet have all times thought good to have Kings, and to reduce the judgement of many unto one. The Government which God made choice of to ſet up among his people was Monarchicall ſtill, firſt in Moſes, then in the Judges, then in the Kings; yea generally all Authours yeeld, and experience ha's taught it, That Monarchy is a better government then Ariſtocracy, becauſe the Tyranny and Miſcarriage of one, ſometime happening in a Monarchy, is nothing ſo dangerous as Oligarchy, Faction, and Diviſion uſually incident to Ariſtocracy or the Government by many equals. Againe, as all times have thought it reaſonable to have Monarchy, which ſettles

the chiefe power and finall judgement in One; ſo will there be alwayes ſufficient reaſon ro withhold the King from a wilfull deniall of his Conſent to the free and unaminous Vote of his Houſes: He cannot but ſee there will alwayes be ſome neceſſary good accrewing to him by his Parliament, that will keepe him in all reaſon from doing ſo, and no caſes can be put or inconvenienees feared upon his Power of denying, but greater and more eminent will appeare upon his not having it, as ha's beene inſinuated, and now do follow.

Fourthly therefore and laſtly we anſwer. Such power of reſiſtance would be no fit meanes of ſafety to a State, but prove a remedy worſe then the diſeaſe. This is very plaine by the drift of the Apoſtles reaſons which he gave againſt reſiſtance, in the 3, 4, 5, 6. v. of the 13. to the Rom. in which we may conſider, that, although the Powers then were altogether unjuſt, tyrannicall, ſubverters of true Religion, nothing anſwerable to the end for which the Governing power is ordained, yet doth the Apoſtle draw his reaſons againſt the reſiſting of them, from that good, that juſtice, that order for which God hath ſet up the higher Powers; to inſinuate, that the reſiſting of the higher Powers, even when they are ſo, does tend to the overthrow of that order which is the life of a Commonwealth; and this not onely becauſe there is ſtill order under tyranny, but chiefely becauſe if it were good and lawfull to reſiſt the power, when abuſed, it would open a way to the people upon the like pretences to reſiſt and overthrow even Powers duely adminiſtred for the executing of wrath upon them that do evill.

I enter this diſcourſe, not to caſt the leaſt blemiſh upon Parliaments (which are an onely remedy for diſtempers of the Kingdome) not to reflect upon the intentions of thoſe that are yet reſident in that high Court, (unto God, the judge of all, they ſtand or fall) not to raiſe jealouſies, but to ſettle Conſcience, and in the way of reaſoning to ſhew, according to the Apoſtles reaſons, what dangers and evils may enſue upon this power of reſiſtance.

For firſt of all, This power of reſiſtance, if admitted and purſued, may proceed to a change of Government, the Principles that now are gone upon, and have carried it ſo farre as we ſee at this day, may alſo lead it on to that greateſt of evils: and I have heard and ſeen it defended by the example of the Low-countreyes; how they excuſe it throughly,

throughly, I examine not, but this I am ſure they can ſay, That their Prince, ſucceeding in the right of the Duke of Burgundy was admitted upon other conditions, then the Kings of England are: alſo that a contrary religion was enforced upon them by a terrible Inquiſition, whereas they that do reſiſt the higher Powers here, do freely enjoy their religion, and have the Princes promiſe and proteſtation for it.

Secondly, This Power of reſiſtance when uſed and purſued, is accompanied with the evils of Civill warre; Former times ſhew it, and and how little was gained by it beſide the expence of bloud; as when all was referred to the rule and diſpoſing of the 12 Peeres, how long laſted it? what ſecurity had the State by it? and at this day we feel and groan under the evils brought upon us through this Power of reſiſtance, the Law ſilenced, the Propertie and Libertie of the Subject every where invaded: and the Lord knowes when or how we ſhall be reſtored to them, or better ſecured in them by this way.

Thirdly, we ſee the danger, if (as it is now ſaid, for the juſtifying of this power of reſiſtance, the King will not diſcharge his truſt, and therefore it fals to the repreſentative body of the people to ſee to it, ſo) the people being diſcontented, and having gotten power ſhall ſay, The Members of the two Houſes do not diſcharge the truſt committed to them, they do not that for which they were choſen and ſent for, then may the multitude by this rule and principle now taught them take the Power to themſelves, it being claimed by them, and ſay to their Rulers as Numb. 16. *Ye take too much upon you*, or as Cade and Tylar, boaſt themſelves Reformers of the Commonwealth, overthrow King and Parliament, fill all with rapine and confuſion, draw all to a Folkmoot, and make every ſhire a ſeverall Government.

Theſe are Dangers and Evils not conceived in the phanſie, but ſuch as reaſon tels us may follow, and experience hath often, and this day doth ſhew us, do ariſe upon this Power of reſiſtance; and for the preventing of which, the Apoſtle gave his reaſons againſt reſiſting even of abuſed Powers, as we heard above.

Laſtly therefore, Seeing ſome muſt be truſted in every State, 'tis reaſon the higheſt and finall truſt ſhould be in the higher or ſupreme Power with whom next to himſelfe God hath intruſted the whole Kingdome, all other that have power and truſt, having it under him as ſent by him; Good reaſon, I ſay, that the ſupreme Power (which is worth

worth 10000 of the Subjects) should have the best security on it's side, for as much as Order, the life of a Common-wealth, is so best preserved, and not so endangered by Tyrannie, as by Factions, Division, Tumults, power of Resistance on the subjects part; and this is according to the drift of the Apostles reasons against Resistance, as before they were laid downe.

Well now unto all that hath hitherto beene said from Scripture and Reason, let Conscience adde the Oath of Supremacie and Allegiance; also the late Protestation, and consider what duty lies upon every subject by the former, to defend the Kings person and right against what power soever; and how by the latter he hath protested and undertaken before Almighty God, in the first place to defend the same; and then what can Conscience conclude from the Premises? that the Prince hath his Power for the good of his people? True, but that Power cannot be prevalent for the good and protection of his people, unlesse it be preserved to him intire, unlesse he hath the Power of Deniall, and the chiefe command of Armes; or that the Prince hath a limited Power, according to the Lawes established? True, but if Conscience be perswaded he does not not hold himselfe within those bounds so fixed, can it be perswaded also that the people may reassume that Power they never had? or take that Sword out of his hand that God hath put into it? No, Conscience will looke at that Power as the Ordinance of God, and the abuse of that Power as a judgement and scourge of God upon the people, and will use not Armes to resist the Ordinance under pretence of resisting the abuse, but cries and prayers to God, petitions to the Prince, denials of obedience to his unjust commands, denials of subsidies, aids, and all faire meanes that are fit for Subjects to use; and when done all, if not succeed, will rather suffer then resist: so would a truly informed Conscience resolve, were the Prince indeed what he is supposed to be, and did he doe indeed as the people are made to feare and beleeve he will doe.

Hitherto we have beene in the examination of the Principle upon which they goe that plead for Resistance, and we have found both Scripture and Reason speake plainly against the resisting even of abused Powers, professed enemies to Religion, actuall subverters of the peoples Liberties, how much more against the resisting of a Prince that professeth the same Religion which we freely enjoy; promiseth the

the maintaining of that and our liberties, onely upon a ſuppoſall hee will not ſtand to his word, will overthrow all.

This however it may ſeem leſſe reaſonable to the Statiſt in the way of policy, permitting as little as he can to the goodneſſe of the Prince or the providence of God for the ſafety of the State; yet ought it to ſatisfy a Chriſtian in the way of Conſcience, which when it comes to a deſire of being ſafe, will not reſt till it have a ſure ground, which here it hath againſt reſiſtance laid down by Scripture and Reaſon; even the Apoſtles reaſons ſo powerfull againſt reſiſtance.

The ſumme of all is this, Conſcience hears the Apoſtle expreſſely forbid all under the higher Power to reſiſt, finds no other clear Scripture to limit it, finds that the limitations given will not conſiſt with it, for the reaſons of them (that are drawn from the election of the people, and the Covenant ſuppoſed therein, from the neceſſity of meanes of ſafety in every State to provide for it ſelfe) were as ſtrong in the Romane State as any; nay, are ſuppoſed by thoſe that urge them, to bee the Fundamentals of every State; and ſo reſiſtance is forbidden as well here, as there in the Romane State, which is alſo cleared by the Apoſtles reaſons, ſhewing the power of reſiſtance cannot be the meanes of ſafety, but ſtrikes at Order and Power it ſelfe, though made againſt tyrannicall and abuſed Powers, as before often inſinuated. Therefore Conſcience will not dare to go againſt the Apoſtles expreſſe prohibition, leſt it fall into the judgement denounced by him.

But if there ſhall be any Conſcience as ſtrongly carried away with the name of a Parliament, as the Papiſts are with the name of the Church, and thinking Religion may be defended any way, and that upon ſuppoſall that their Prince is minded to change it, (which is another humour of Popery) will not be perſwaded that the reſiſtance made upon the preſent ſuppoſall is unlawfull, againſt Gods word, and reaſon; I am ſure ſuch a Conſcience cannot be truly perſwaded it is lawfull, but muſt want that clear ground it ought to have, eſpecially in a matter ſo expreſly againſt the Apoſtle, and of ſuch high concernment as damnation; muſt needs run blindly, and headlong by a ſtrange implicit faith upon ſo great a hazard,

SECT. VI.

NOw we come to the application of their principle to the preſent, where we muſt enquire according to the ſecond and third Generals, whether the reſiſtance now made be ſuch as is pretended to by them in ſuch a caſe as they ſuppoſed, and then whether Conſcience can be truly perſwaded the King is ſuch and ſo minded, as in the caſe he is ſuppoſed to be.

The chiefe conſiderations of theſe two Generals, are matters of fact; The principle was examined by Scripture and Reaſon, theſe admit the judgement of ſenſe, and are cleared by what we heare and ſee; which judgement of ſenſe is not ſo eaſily captivated by an implicit faith as that of reaſon is; inſomuch as Conſcience here cannot be ſo blinded but it may ſee, that (were the principle good on which they reſt, yet) this reſiſtance which they make, is not ſuch as they pretend to; and that this King, whom they reſiſt is not ſuch as in the caſe they ſuppoſed him to be, not ſuch as ought to be reſiſted according to their owne grants.

The ſecond Generall was, That the Reſiſtance now made is not ſuch as is pretended to by them that plead for it, and therefore Conſcience cannot be truly perſwaded it may lawfully bear part in it, or aſſiſt them that in the purſuit of it pretend one thing and do another.

It was premiſed at the beginning that ſuch a reſiſtance ſhould bee *omnibus ordinibus regni conſentientibus*, agreed upon and undertaken by the generall and unanimous conſent of the whole State, and that it ſhould be onely *Legitima defenſio*, a mere defenſive reſiſtance; and theſe laid down, not that I admit reſiſtance however conditioned (for all that I have ſaid before doth altogether condemn it) but according to their own grants that plead for it: To this purpoſe it is that they ſay the King is *Univerſis minor*, leſſe then the whole State, and every body naturally defends it ſelfe. Therefore if a contention be between the Head and the Body, it muſt in all reaſon be the whole Body that is ſet againſt it; and if there be ſuch an appearing againſt the Supreme Power, as tends to reſiſtance, the conſent and judgememt of the whole Kingdome muſt be againſt him, or elſe every prevailing faction might indanger the State by cauſing ſuch changes and evils as now it's threatned

ned with: This is the reason of this unreasonable power of resistance in the people.

Well then, how shall Conscience be perswaded that this resistance was agreed upon by an unanimous and free consent of the States assembled in the two Houses, such as in this case may be called the judgement of the whole Kingdome?

He that knowes how the *Militia* (in which this resistance chiefly began) was brought in, with what oppositon, especially in the Lords house, and by what number there at length was voted; also how the like proceedings of resistance, that have beene voted since, are declared against, by a greater number of each House then doe remaine in either, such as have beene cast out, or withdrawne themselves upon dislike of these proceedings: can he, I say, that knowes this (and who knowes it not that hath eyes and eares?) be in Conscience perswaded, that this is such an unanimous, free, and generall consent, the judgement of the whole Kingdome?

For though a Vote passed by a few upon the place hath the power and condition of a Vote for the formality of Law, yet, if the question be, Was this passed in full Assemblies? Was it freely and generally carried? Did they all unanimously *as one man* consent unto it? Conscience cannot be convinced there is such efficacy in the place, as to make a few the whole; or their agreement to be that judgement of the whole Kingdome, that unanimous consent, which must be in the case of resistance, by their acknowledgement that plead for it. For were it in this case to be held for the judgement of the whole, which is passed by a few, then would the State be unreasonably exposed to that danger (above-mentioned) which every prevailing faction might bring upon it under the pretence of the judgement of the whole Kingdome.

Againe, as Conscience cannot be truly perswaded, that this resistance is agreed upon with such a generall, and unanimous consent, as they themselves pretend to, which plead for this resistance, so can it not be truly perswaded that this resistance is such for the meere defensive way of it, as it ought to be according to their grants and pretences that appeare for it.

Conscience here will see how to resolve, upon the triall of these two particulars, Whether the King or they be upon the defensive

part? then, Whether the managing of this Warre, or resistance on their parts, be so void of hostile acts, as the defensive way, which they pretend to, ought to be?

Conscience will discerne whether part is upon the defensive, by inquiring, First, Who were first in Armes? He that can number the succession of weekes and moneths in his Almanack may decide this. He shall finde that armed men were thrust into *Hull*, the Kings Armes seized against his will, the *Militia* set up, and by that the Kings Subjects drawne into Armes, before the King had any thing to oppose but Proclamations: that subscriptions for Plate, Money, Horse; that listing of Souldiers for the field, and appointing of Officers of the Army were begun upon their part, before His Majestie did the like. Now resistance doth in the word it selfe and in their pretence presuppose a power and force first made against them, whereas it is plaine, they were still upon the preventing and forehand with the King, still shewed him example for what he hath done since in the way of Armes: yet must the people believe he raises the Warre, and they are upon defence; but Conscience will not be so forced.

Secondly, by inquiring what is the cause of these Armes? What doe they contend for? Although it be cleare, that if Subjects be first in Armes, they cannot be upon the defensive; yet the consideration of the cause will more apparently convince it, when Conscience shall see it is not for what is pretended, but for something the King hath right to deny, that this resistance is made. The preservation of Religion and Liberties is pretended, but can it be for either? The King denies them not: Their Religion they freely enjoy; and was it ever knowne that Subjects should rise in Armes against their Prince for a Religion which he promises to maintaine? Or doth Religion stand in need of a defence, which it selfe condemnes, a defence which would be a perpetuall scandall to it? If therefore Religion be the pretence but no cause of Warre, then is the Warre raised on their part, the King is upon the defensive. Or can it bee for ancient Rights and undoubted Priviledges that they contend? The King denies them not, promiseth all security so he may enjoy his owne, and God forbid that either He or they should suffer in their just Rights. But would any man ever have defended the revolt of the ten Tribes, if *Rehoboam* had promised to conserve their Liberties? What shall we then thinke of this generall Revolt from Allegiance that hath possessed

fessed well neare ten Tribes of twelve? They suppose hee will not make good his promises, and therefore they will make all sure, seize his Armes and Forts, strip him of all, and if he begin to stir for his owne Right and Dignity, then the people must be made to believe he makes warre against his Parliament, intends to destroy their Liberties. But can any man in Conscience thinke His Majestie since the beginning of this breach was ever in such a condition of strength as might threaten the Liberty of the Subject, or destroy Parliaments, when as it was long ere he could with much adoe attaine to any reasonable meanes of subsistence, or to such a strength whereby he might seeme to be able to defend himselfe?

To speake the truth, Religion and Liberties can be no other then the pretence of this Warre, the King hath fortified them so with many Acts of Grace passed this Parliament, that they cannot be in that danger which is pretended for the raising of this Warre. It must be something that His Majestie does indeed deny, for which the contention is raised: That we shall finde to be His Power of Armes and ordering the *Militia* of the Kingdome, His power of denying in Parliament, His disposing of the Offices of State, and such like; Also the Government of the Church and the Revenue of it. In the three former he challenges his right, as his Predecessours had; the other he is bound by Oath to maintaine, as by Law they are established. Well, if these be attempted, and His Majestie will not be forced from them, cannot yeild them up, but it comes to Armes, then will Conscience easily be convinced the King is upon the defensive, for the maintaining of what he justly holds his right, or is bound by Oath to defend.

And if we hearken to the peoples voice, for that commonly speaks the minde of their leaders, we shall heare them usually call this Warre, as they did that with the *Scots*, the Bishops Warre. His Majestie hath indeed alwaies declared against the altering of the Government of the Church by Bishops, being such as it alwaies had since the first receiving of the Christian Faith in this Land, and of all other Governments simply the best, if reformed from abuses and corruptions that have growne upon it, to the purging out of which His Majestie is alwaies ready to agree. But be it the Bishops Warre (though the abolishing of that Government be but one of the many inconveniences which this power of resistance doth threaten this Land with, and which the

King hath not (in by Power of Armes to divert) whether is it so just in Subjects by Armes to force a change of Government which was alwayes in the Church, and by Law established, as it is in the King to defend the same as he is bound by Oath? it is cleare which of the two are upon the defensive.

The second particular by which the defensive way of this resistance is to be examined, was the managing of this Warre on their parts, whether so void of acts of Hostility as that defensive way should be which they pretend to. *Davids* resistance made against *Saul* is frequently alledged by them; which example, though it will not countenance their cause (as was shewed before) yet might it tell them their demeanour should be answerable. He offered no act of violence to *Saul*, but still gave place and withdrew from him: the Speare indeed and the Cruse *David* tooke away from the Kings head, but it was onely to shew *Abners* neglect, who had the command of *Sauls* Militia, and to testifie his owne integrity, therefore he restored them before they were demanded, 1 *Sam.* 26.

But now the Kings Speare and his Cruse, his Ammunition and his necessary Provisions are taken away, intercepted, not restored though often demanded, used against him with all advantage; nay, he is stript of the very power and command of Armes, his Officers and Ministers thrust out, and other substituted, and by them his people drawne into Armes against him.

Also by these that are in resistance against the King, his Loyall and Peaceable Subjects are assaulted, despoiled of their Armes, Goods, Estates; their persons imprisoned, because they would according to their Allegiance assist him in this extremity, or would not, contrary to their Conscience, joyne with them against him. What Conscience that will not follow this way with a stupid implicit faith, can be perswaded that this Warre is the defence of the Subjects Liberties, and not rather an oppugnation of them? or that it is a meere resistance or withstanding of a force first made against them, and not rather a violent illation or bringing in of force upon those that were disposed to peace. Therefore no Conscience that hath a sense of Religion, or of that which is just and right betweene man and man, can beare a part in this resistance, for feare of that sentence of damnation which the Apostle hath laid upon it.

SECT. VII.

SECT. VII.

BUt in the last place, if Conscience could be perswaded, that it is lawfull upon such a case, as they make, to take Armes and resist; and that this rising in Armes is such a defensive resistance, as in such a case they seeme to pretend to, yet how will it be perswaded that the Case is now, that is, That the King is such as the people must be made to beleeve he is, unlesse it will as desperately offend against the rule of Charity, in so concluding upon the King, as it doth against the rule of Faith and Perswasion, in admitting so ungrounded a principle as is now rested on for resistance: so that such a Conscience shall have in its perswasion neither certainty of Rule, for the principle it goes on is false; nor certainty of the Case, for it knowes not the heart of the King, to conclude for resistance upon suppofals of his intentions; and in its judgement it will be altogether void of Charity.

Indeed it concerns all such as will resist upon the principles now taught to render their Prince odious to his people under the hatefull notion of Tyrant, Subverter of Religion, and Lawes, a Person not to be trusted, or at least as one seduced to such evill designes, by wicked Counsell. But what? hath this King forbid the exercise of the Religion established, or left off to professe it himselfe? hath he disclaimed his trust, or not upon all occasions promised justice and libertie to his Subjects?

Yea! but they have cause to feare Popery will prevaile, and that he will not stand to his promises. It seems they are men that would be loath to suffer for their Religion, they are so ready to fly to Armes to secure themselves; But shall Subjects rise in Armes against their Prince upon such remote feares and jealousies as these will appear to be, when can such be wanting in turbulent minded? When shall the Prince be assured of safety? This was the way that David himselfe was shaken out of his throne, and driven from Jerusalem by Absolom: This cunning Rebell steals away their hearts by raising jealousies in them and an evill opinion of Davids government, 2 Sam. 15. 3. Some ground, in seem, he had for his treacherous plea, through the negligence of those that were under David; but it was his villanie to make use of it to the alienating of the People from their King. Accordingly let us now consider

sider what slender grounds our people have for their feares and jealousies, then what security they have and might have against them, that it may appear how causelesse those jealousies are in themselves, how unjust causes of this resistance.

If we examine the feares and jealousies that have possessed the people, we shall find them to be raised upon these or the like grounds; Reports of forreign Power to be brought in, The Queens Religion, The resort of Papists to his Majestie, His intercepting of meanes sent for the relefe of Ireland, from whence the people by their good teachers are made to believe, that he meanes to enslave this people, reestablish
K. *John.* Popery, and does comply with the Rebels.

In answer to all which I need not to say more then what Michael the Archangel to the devil that arch-accuser, *The Lord rebuke thee*, Jude 9. but in particular; For such reports of invasions from abroad, as were, before the setting up of the *Militia*, given out to keep the people amused, the easier to draw them into a Posture of Defence as was pretended, all such are discovered by time to have been vain; if there be now any forreign aydes towards the King (as all Christian Kings cannot but think themselves concerned in the cause) it will be as just for him to use them against subjects now in Armes, as it was unjust in the Barons to call in the French against their naturall King.

For the Queens Majesty; Her Religion is no new cause, if it be a sufficient cause of jealousie to them, they have had it from her first entrance, I would to God it were otherwise with her, that it would please the Lord to open her eyes that she may se the truth & light of the Protestant Religion: onely this I must say, this is not the way to draw her to it, if she look at it in the doctrines and practices of these times she is not like to fall in love with it.

For the resort of Papists, and the Kings entertaining them; He hath often declared what caution he desired to use therein, til necessity hath driven him to admit of some few into his Army, which also his Majesty hath often and sufficiently answered. Let me adde this; If he hath entertained any into this service, he may justly make use of them. We see what manner of men were gathered to David in his distresse, 1. Sam. 22. 2. and how false Ziba bringing provision to the King when he fled from Absolom, was entertained and rewarded, insomuch that the King (when afterward he knew how Ziba had abused him to gain

his

his own ends) would not reverſe the ſentence pronounced in his favor; If therefore in this diſtreſſe after much forbearance our King hath admitted the help of ſome Recuſants, it cannot be alleadged as a cauſe of the reſiſtance now made againſt him, but that reſiſtance was a cauſe of it; and if the Papiſt will ſhew himſelfe a good ſubject, it is juſt and reaſonable that the King when he is put to it, may admit of his helpe, and the more ſhame it is for them that profeſſe the Proteſtant Religion to force him to it; a ſcandall that would not eaſily be wiped off from our Religion, were it to ſtand or fall, by the doctrines of this giddy Age.

Laſtly, His Majeſtie hath written enough for the clearing himſelfe from thoſe falſe and odious imputations laid upon him in relation to the Iriſh buſineſſe. I have onely thus much to ſay, concerning any thing intended for the reliefe of Ireland; It was great pitie they ſhould want it there, but it is more pitifull, the King ſhould be forced to make uſe of it here.

It is not long ſince our neighbour Nation brought an Army into the Northern parts of this Kingdome to the great detriment of the inhabitants there, and it was excuſed by invincible neceſſity, which drove them hither. The neceſſity his Majeſtie was driven to is ſufficiently known, and might excuſe him, in taking his own where he meets with it, and drawing it from his ſervice abroad to that which more nearly concerned him at home. And when his Arms, Moneys, and proviſions are ſeized on wherever they be found intended for him, and imployed againſt him in a Warre, the Lord knowes how unneceſſary, ſhall it not be lawfull for him to take ſome part of them where he finds it for his neceſſary defence?

Indeed the diſtreſſe of Ireland by the help of wicked Pamphlets hath been uſed as a great engine to weaken the Kings reputation with his people; but upon whoſe account the heavy reckoning of that neglected Cauſe will be laid, together with the diſturbance of this Kingdome, any man in Conſcience may eaſily diſcern, that ſees what ſufficient and reaſonable meanes might have been had for the ſecurity of Religion and Liberties, and for the redreſſe of all juſt grievances before this time. Which is the next thing conſiderable: What his Majeſtie hath done and proffered to exempt theſe ſcruples of feare and jealouſies out of his peoples minds.

For Religion, if it be a new Frame they contend for, I muſt acknowledge he declares againſt all ſuch; but if they deſire the continuance of that true Proteſtant Religion, which hath been profeſſed without interruption from the beginning of the Queens dayes, and eſtabliſhed by the Lawes of this Land; that he undertakes to maintain, that he hath proteſted in the head of his Army to defend. For Matter of Church-government and diſcipline he hath offered any juſt reformation, even with a reſpect to tender conſciences in point of Ceremony, hath often called his two Houſes to the work in drawing up the grievances to ſome head. For priviledges of Parliaments and libertie of Subjects he hath given them the like promiſes with the deepeſt proteſtations; and by an excellent moderation, amidſt the preſſures and neceſſities of Warre, hath ſhown what reſpect he hath to the propertie and libertie of the Subject. Laſtly, For his choice of Officers of State, he hath promiſed to admit any juſt exception, and thereupon to relinquiſh the Perſon; and as an aſſurance of all theſe hath ſo far condeſcended as to take away Starre-chamber, High-commiſſion, Biſhops votes, &c. and to grant the Continuance of this Parliament, and the conſtant returne of a Triennial; And now after all theſe promiſes and proteſtations, and ſo many reall expreſſions of Grace, can any man in conſcience thinke there was yet place left for Propoſitions of ſuch neceſſary concernment, that except they be granted, this Kingdome muſt be imbroyled in a civill War, and the reliefe of *Ireland* neglected? I ſpeake not this to caſt any blemiſh upon the wiſedome of the great Councell, or upon their deſires and endeavours to gaine a greater ſecurity to the Publique: but I would to God the King were once thought worthy to be truſted a little, and that the Conſciences of his Subjects were more reſpected, which cannot ſo eaſily be commanded into a reſiſtance, being very tender in the points of damnation, and taught out of Gods Word not to raiſe ſo much as an Eccleſ. 10. evill thought againſt the King, much leſſe to lift up an armed hand.

Every mans Conſcience now is ſolicited to adhere either to the King in this great cauſe, or to joyne with Subjects in making reſiſtance: To draw it from Allegiance, tongues are ſet on fire of Hell, which blaſt His Majeſties Actions and Declarations; and bookes written by helliſh ſpirits, enemies to peace and quietneſſe, are ſuffered to iſſue forth into every corner of the Land to poſſeſſe the people, That His Promiſes

ses are but words, His Acts of Grace were forced, he will not stand to them: It seems then he must by force of Armes be compelled to be willing. But let us see whether a Conscience that desires to be safe can be so perswaded in judging the actions and intentions of him, to whom it owes the highest duty under God, as first to conclude he intends not as he promises, and thereupon to resolve for resistance? No, it will direct it selfe by the rule of Charity, which is, not rashly to conclude upon the heart which it knoweth not, or to thinke any evill; and if the difference be betwixt two, as in this cause, it will hold the rule of indifferency, impartially to consider the actions of both.

Conscience therefore that it may be informed of His Majesties intentions, Will it looke upon Him at such a distance as *London*, and reade Him onely in those horrid relations that issue thence, and conceive of Him as they report Him to the people? or will it consider some failings that necessity hath inforced, or other accidentall occurrences have occasioned, and from these conclude intentions in Him, contrary to all His Promises and Protestations? This would be too partiall, too uncharitable: Conscience ought alwayes to be tender in judging upon other mens intentions, especially those of the Prince, and those to be concluded as evill, and to be made a ground for resistance, which runs the hazard of Damnation.

For as there was enough in *David* to cleare those jealousies, upon which that rebellion of the people following *Absolom* was grounded, so is there on the Kings part, to direct Conscience against this desperate uncharitable judgement, if it looke at those many Acts of Grace, as new additions to that security, by which this State hath so long stood, and from them conclude, He would not in a faire way deny any thing reasonable: If it consider those many promises strengthened with the deepest Protestations, enforced with desires of successe from God, according to His just intentions; and all these, as proceeding from a King, under such affliction, in such danger, after such successe and experience of Gods protection, approving thereby the reality and sincerity of His heart: What Conscience can here conclude contrary intentions in Him, and not thinke it blasphemeth God and the King?

Furthermore, as Conscience will not be uncharitable when it judgeth upon the intentions of another mans heart, so neither will it be

partiall when it judgeth betweene two, unto which of them it should incline: and therefore he that is abusèd to believe amisse of his King, and solicited to enter this way of resistance, is highly concerned first to consider, Whether they also that are the maine directors of it, and to whom he would adhere, doe discharge their trust they are called to. I say such an one, unlesse he will resigne up his faith to men, and receive their dictates as the immediate rule of his Conscience, must consider whether all be just and honest that is done in that way? Whether to devest the King of the Power of Armes, and to use them against him, be to defend his Person, Rights, and Dignity? Whether the forcing of the Subjects property, to the advancing of this resistance, and the imprisoning of their persons for deniall, be the maintaining of the Right and Liberty of the Subject? Whether the suffering of so many Sects to vent their Doctrines with such liberty, and to commit unsufferable outrages upon the publike worship of God with such licentiousnesse, be a defending of Religion and the established worship of this Church? All these duties every Subject respectively is bound to discharge, and the neglect of them His Majestie hath chiefly charged upon those that he conceives the chiefe Directours and Actors in this resistance made against him, and every man in conscience ought seriously to consider it.

The necessity of the Common-wealth is pretended to defend the not-defending of the premises, when as no necessity may excuse any failings on the Kings part; as if his promises, by which he stands obliged to his Subjects, did not suppose they for their parts also should performe: I know not how some particular men may be engaged, and contract a necessity of resisting, or seeking safety by Armes; but I am perswaded, no man in Conscience can think it a necessity of the Common-wealth to have all confounded, or of a Christian to run the hazard of damnation by resisting. My Conscience tells me, and so will theirs one day tell them, how much they have to answer for not improving that grace and willingnesse, they had experience of in his Majestie, and might still have found in him, to the speedy and happy reformation of this Church and State; I pray God to give them Consciences truly inlightned, and bowels truly compassionate, that they may speedily and feelingly be sensible of the miseries this Land groanes under, and faithfully examine how farre they are answerable for them, by re-

jecting

jecting such reasonable meanes of security, as they might have had for the safety of this Sate. *Amen.*

And now if there be any one that will runne the hazard of this resistance, I desire he would first set his Conscience before the Tribunall of God, where it must appeare, and consider whether it will excuse him there, when he hath shed the bloud of others, and expended his owne, to say, I verily supposed and believed my Prince would change Religion, overthrow our Liberties. I must tell him it will not be safe for him to present such a Conscience at that barre; a Conscience that wanted the rule of Faith to warrant and perswade the lawfulnesse of resistance upon such a supposall, a Conscience that wanted the certainty of perswasion, that the Princes heart (which God onely knowes) was so inclined, a Conscience that wanted the judgement of Charity, in concluding such intentions in the King, notwithstanding all His Promises and deepest Protestations made in the time of his trouble; without which Charity all is nothing, though he layes downe (as he thinkes) his life for Religion. Such a Conscience I must needs conclude sinfull, and liable to that which the Apostle threatens unto Resistance, Damnation.

FINIS.